

REMARKS

The Examiner has stated that claims 12-20 would be allowable.

The Examiner objected to claims 2-7 and 9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner objected to claim 1, indicating line 4 should be changed to from "ands read" to --and read--. In response, Applicants have corrected claim 1. Applicants found the error to actually be "anda read" and have corrected it to be -- and a read--.

The Examiner objected to claim 10, indicating "what is claimed is" should be deleted and the Examiner objected to claim 10 under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. In light of the Applicants canceling of claim 10, Applicants believe the Examiner's objection to claim 10 is moot.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 (2nd paragraph), as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have changed the dependency of claim 11, to depend from new method claim 21. In light of the Applicants changing of the dependency of claim 11, Applicants believe the Examiner's rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 (2nd paragraph), is moot.

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. In light

BUR920040014US1

of the Applicants changing of the dependency of claim 11, Applicants believe the Examiners rejection of claim 11 35 U.S.C. 10 is moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0202014).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(c) rejection with the following arguments.

BUR920040014US1

10

35 USC § 102

As to claim 1, the Examiner states that "Palmer et al. disclose an electronic circuit (Figure.2) , comprising a memory cell array (203) including a sense amplifier self-timed decode circuit (215) adapted to set a base read time delay of said memory cell array; and a read adjustment circuit (213) coupled to said memory cell array, said read delay adjustment circuit adapted to adjust said base read time delay of the memory array based on an operating frequency of the memory cell array (paragraphs [0017], [0018], [0023], [0024])."

Preliminary to Applicants arguments, Applicants respectfully point out "read delay" is a delay of the turning on of the sense amplifiers in order to allow bitlines time to pre-charge prior to the turn of the sense amplifiers and is so defined in Applicants paragraph [0021].

Applicants contend that claim 1 is not anticipated by Palmer et al. because Palmer et al. does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Palmer et al. does not teach "a read delay adjustment circuit coupled said memory cell array, said read delay adjustment circuit adapted to adjust said base read time delay of said memory array based on an operating frequency of said memory cell array." Applicants respectfully point out element 213 is simply a sense amplifier comprising a pair of cross-coupled inverters (see Palmer et al. FIG. 3, which is a schematic circuit diagram of sense amplifier circuit 213, and paragraph [0019] and [0020]) and does not have the capacity to "adjust said base read time delay of said memory array based on an operating frequency of said memory cell array" as Applicants claim 1 requires because (1) there are no clock inputs to sense amplifier circuit 213 to enable sense amplifier circuit 213 to sense the operating frequency of the memory cell array and (2) there are no outputs of sense amplifier circuit 213 effected by the memory cell operating frequency. Sense amplifier circuit 213 is

BUR920040014US1

11

responsive only to SENSE ENABLE and will operate independently of the operating frequency of the memory array (see FIGs 1, 2 and 3 of Palmer et al.).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Palmer et al. and is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-9 depend from claim Palmer et al., Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 2-9 are likewise in condition for allowance.

BUR920040014US1

12

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: Canada et al.

Dated: 04/20/2005

BY: Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Reg. No. 44,688
FOR:
Anthony M. Palagonia
Registration No.: 41,237

3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850
Agent Direct Dial Number: (802)-899-5460

BUR920040014US1

13